

LETTERS

ON THE

Management of Toronto University,

AND THE PROPOSED RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENTS OF

LAW AND MEDICINE.

n for

Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE WESLEYAN BOOK AND JOB PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.

1856.

gical
 over
 ut v
 arg-
 al p
 men
 from
 t su
 han
 ed
 sun
 nd
 t la
 s or
 uile
 de
 ju
 t it
 , a
 ays
 W
 ling
 nen
 r's
 outa
 es t
 ash
 nei

 tisi
 nce
 ad
 ite
 1,00
 na
 the
 n t
 ne
 35
 a c
 rec
 pi
 ,9
 or
 ad
 l
 ed
 rid
 N
 he
 ar

JOHN DONOGH, Printer.

*This great
educational
Law
service*

The fol
and with
have been
writer is.
waste of
voted ann
general m
expended
the numbe
the origin
of the sam
drawn fro
undue adv
brought t
under our
bly mana
by it, in
ters inste
results, a
is deeply
annually
eight or
students
Have yo

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

This great University a great failure—\$40,000 expended annually to educate twenty-eight Students—\$30,000 more proposed to educate Lawyers and Doctors, who will make us pay over again for their services—\$300,000 to erect buildings!

TO THE PEOPLE OF CANADA.

The following series of Letters was published in the *Christian Guardian*, and with no intention that they should appear in their present form. They have been called for, however, by parties who have no knowledge of who the writer is. They were undertaken with the hope of arresting the iniquitous waste of money that belongs to you all, and which is as much yours as any voted annually by Parliament from the consolidated fund. In doing this, the general management, or rather mismanagement, of the \$40,000 now annually expended, came under review, as well as the result of this immense outlay, in the number of students educated for this extravagant amount. According to the original design, as newspaper articles, these contain several reiterations of the same facts, and for very obvious reasons. The facts themselves are drawn from official reports published by authority of Parliament, so that no undue advantage has been taken of any of the parties concerned. There is brought to light, in these pages, a state of things not very creditable to us under our boasted Responsible Government. Matters are just as discredibly managed now as when we had no such system. And what have we gained by it, in regard to the higher education of our youth? Just one set of masters instead of another, and these as extravagant, as unproductive of good results, as selfish and as unreasonable as those whom we have driven off. It is deeply humiliating to think, that *forty thousand dollars* should be drawn annually from our noble university endowment, simply *for the support of some eight or ten Professors, and the education of only twenty-eight* matriculated students! After years of trial, this is all the return we have for our money. Have you any doubts as to the truth of these startling statements? Then

n for

read the following articles, and satisfy yourselves with regard to this matter. The entire endowment is the property of the public; the lands were taken from our public patrimony. Like a mighty gourmand, this University devours our endowment, year after year, until soon nothing will be left; and it gives us back—what? Just *twenty-eight students!*

Let us instruct our Representatives to *reform* this abuse. The "Provincial University" is a burlesque upon the name; the present scheme has failed utterly to serve any valuable purpose. In the last of these articles, I have suggested a plan that has elsewhere proved signally successful. The one numbers its students by *two or three tens*, the other by *hundreds and thousands!* Which shall we have in Canada?

MORE ANON.

The an
about to
with the U
would sup
in this Un
that direc
ordinary e
the fees o
last April
number o
you state
of each
do the pe
might be
in making
with a lar
and cond
not that
and Med
I am n
the publi
the state
law and
when pra
earn the
wealthies
given to
his famil
cian and
the differ
is more
gives a
public h

to this matter.
nds were taken
iversity devours
ft; and it gives

The "Provin-
cheme has failed
articles, I have
sful. The one
hundreds and

TORE ANON.

LETTER I.

The announcement contained in the last *Guardian*, that an attempt is about to be made to establish Medical and Law Colleges in connection with the University of Toronto, has taken many persons by surprise. One would suppose that the experience already acquired in conducting one College in this University, would deter any government from any further progress in that direction. According to the Report of the Bursar for 1854, the ordinary expenses of University College for that year were £10,291, besides the fees of the students; and from the official return made to parliament last April, for the same year—1854, now before me, it appears that the number of Matriculated Students was *twenty-eight*; (not thirty-five, as you stated a week or two ago,) so that the average expense to the province, of each of these students, is £367 10s! What does government, what do the people of Canada say to this? With this experience before them, it might be supposed that the government would hesitate to proceed any further in making bad worse, by attempting to add a Medical and a Law College, with a large staff of Professors and large salaries for each. In endowing and conducting University College, they have only taken us to purgatory,—not that fabled place so called—but in appending to this, Colleges of Law and Medicine of the same stamp, they sink us to the *real* perdition.

I am not at all opposed to the endowment of institutions of learning from the public chest; that is the duty of every Government, since the welfare of the state requires that the people should be educated; but the knowledge of law and medicine is not learning in this sense of the word. That knowledge, when practised, implies both a profession and an art, by which its possessors earn their livelihoods, sustain their families, and become generally the wealthiest portion of the community. As well might the public money be given to teach the arts of tailoring and making shoes. The mechanic sustains his family by the practice of his art—his profession,—and so does the physician and the lawyer; and as a money, a property-making business, what is the difference? If the healing art requires a better previous education, and is more expensive, the remuneration for it is proportionably greater, and it gives a more respectable position in society. It is quite as important for the public health that a shoemaker should be able to make shoes to fit well, save

n for

corns, and keep the feet dry, as that the physician should understand how to cure the diseases caused by the mechanic's ignorance, and make a good pill. The one needs the philosophy of prevention, the other of cure; both sciences are necessary for the welfare of society; and if the one needs such public support as is implied in the establishment of these Colleges, why not the other?

I do not at all wish to depreciate these highly honourable professions; but if they prove abundantly remunerative in after life to those who practise them, is it not reasonable that these should sustain all the expenses necessary in acquiring arts so very lucrative?

Considering the age and maturity of our country, do not our professional men of all names compare favourably with those of any other country? At least your Toronto lawyers delight in making this assertion. And if this high position has been reached without the aid of these expensive institutions, where is the necessity for their establishment? At what colleges of law did our Robinsons, our Macauleys acquire that knowledge that makes the Canadian bar so proud of them? How much of the public funds were expended in securing to these gentlemen their professional celebrity? The necessary training may indeed have drained their own purses, but have they not now a fair return for that outlay? Has it not secured to them very comfortable livelihoods and elevated positions in society? And this is equally true of the great majority of those practicing in the legal and medical professions in this country. What need then of establishing colleges so ruinously expensive?

I know very well the hypocritical plea that will be put forth for their necessity; but, sir, the real plea is here: the men who had fat salaries in the former University need fuller purses than their knowledge of their profession brings them, now that they are thrown upon their own resources, and their real skill is fully tested. "Here's the rub;" this is where the shoe pinches; and it is to afford to Dr. Connor and those legal and medical gentlemen who petitioned Parliament for the re-establishment of these Colleges, a better living than their profession brings them, that these institutions, at an expense to the public of *six or eight thousand pounds a year*, are about to be established. Well, let the Government proceed, we will see the consequences. The people of Canada have called—they still call for efficient and reasonably expensive Universities, Colleges, and Grammar Schools; improvement in this direction is needed, but have they called for Colleges of Law and Medicine? Are there not institutions, at which the knowledge of these pro-

essions can be acquired without any expense to the public chest; and if there is a surplus of means, are there not literary institutions that are doing good service in the cause of education, whose means of extending their operations would be greatly facilitated by affording them a little help?

In my next I intend to send you some facts connected with the expense of conducting University College, and the results, so far, to the country.

March 29th, 1856.

NIMMO.

LETTER II.

"Nimmo"* has promised to furnish you with some facts relating to University College. Permit me to aid in this work, for it evidently demands some attention at the present juncture. This institution was endowed as King's College in 1828, with 226,000 acres of the public lands of the Province. It commenced operations in 1843, with thirty-one matriculated students; (I have the official returns before me,) and in 1854, after twelve years trial, the number had actually *increased backwards to twenty-eight*! This humiliating state of things was owing chiefly to the establishment, in the meantime, of other and more popular Institutions.

In looking over the expenditure since 1843, I find that it has amounted, on an average, to more than £10,000, or \$40,000 annually. The total amount expended up to 1852, was \$505,338; to this add \$40,000 for each year to the present, and we have a grand total of \$636,338, as the expenditure in thirteen years, of a University that can even now present but twenty-eight matriculated students!

We commend these facts to those whom nothing will satisfy but one "great Provincial University," under the direction of Government. Considered in relation to its expenditure and results, it is an "illustrated edition" of the mountain in labor and bringing forth a mouse! Will the country much longer endure this wretched waste of public money? And yet it is to this *prosperous* Institution that the Government now proposes to add Law and Medical Colleges, at an additional cost of not less than *thirty thousand dollars a year*! This, people of Canada, is the wise project of your present rulers. But will the House sanction such a wretched waste of money? Judging from a debate on this subject last week, even some of the opposition

* "Nimmo," the writer of the preceding letter, which is inserted here as preface, upon the responsibility of the publisher.—[ED. GUARDIAN.]

n for

members seem inclined to sustain the insane project; it will increase, they say, the number of students in University College. Never was there a more foolish supposition. The leading denominations have now Universities of their own, well sustained and successfully conducted; in these their adherents have confidence, and to none others will they send. The member for Lambton and all others who think with him, may rest assured of this. The denominations that have no colleges of their own, as the Free and United Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, and these alone will now sustain University College; and indeed, *practically*, it is for their benefit it is now conducted at an annual expense of over \$40,000 to the people of Canada! Can any one deny this? Is there a member of the Government or of the House so credulous as to suppose, that the Church of England people with Trinity College, the Methodists with Victoria College, and the Kirk of Scotland with Queen's College on their hands, and efficiently conducted, will send their youth to an Institution in which they have no confidence? It is perfectly absurd to think so. Hereafter, then, let it be fully understood that University College is maintained chiefly for the four denominations named: they are thus saved the expense of erecting colleges of their own. Indeed, more than this, the Free Church, United Presbyterians, and Congregationalists have Theological Colleges in Toronto, for the training of their ministers; all these young men receive their literary and scientific education at University College; and in this way, is not the Institution that is sustained *professedly* for the *youth of all Canada*, *practically become the literary department of the Theological Schools of the Congregationalists, and the Free and United Presbyterians!* Such is the grand issue of our "great Provincial University"!

Did the projectors of this costly Institution contemplate this? Will the country endure so great a public wrong,—the expenditure of *over forty thousand dollars* annually, of our public funds, for the education of three or four denominations, while all others, comprising the majority of Protestants, are left practically to sustain their own colleges? These churches may well afford to permit Government to conduct the Institution for them, at the expense of the public, while they receive all the benefits—for nothing. Nor are these highly respectable parties deserving of censure for receiving these great national favors. They did not create the state of things that now exists. Parliament has done that for them, and without any intention of favouring these more than others; yet such is the real issue of attempting to

force (for indeed it has been forced) a great Provincial University upon a mixed people, circumstanced as we are in this country. He is a wise legislator who, while he wrongs none, yet frames his measures to meet the peculiar wants and circumstances of the people whom he governs. It is very evident that, in University matters, such a legislator has not yet appeared in Canada.

The scheme of the University now in operation is an insane one; and to crown this iniquity and insanity, it seems that it has actually been decided, that \$280,000 shall be immediately expended in the erection of university buildings, and besides this, a law and a medical college are to be added at an annual expense of \$30,000! And what are the benefits to the country of this wretched waste of money? Why, just, *thirty matriculated students, —the Professors well paid,—the denominations named above, well supplied with the means of educating their sons,—and the lawyers and doctors taught professions which pay them handsomely in after life!* This is the result, and nothing more. By and by the country will see this matter in its true light, and apply the proper remedy; but not, we fear, before the original princely endowment is worse than wasted.

Formerly, when Dr. Strachan controlled King's College for the benefit of his church, the country was roused to action to redress the wrong. Mr. Editor, is the wrong any the less now, that the University of Toronto is maintained at a far greater expense practically for the benefit of four of our Protestant denominations? Will Parliament, will the country look at this question in its true light? Will Parliament persist in perpetuating this great public wrong, this expensive, unproductive folly? If so, when the people of Canada will have seen the matter in its real light, they will say of it, as Cromwell of the mace,—“Take away that bauble;” and never was that term more appropriately applied than to the present and prospective University of Toronto.

The interested friends of this University will probably urge, that sufficient time has not been given to test fully the results of the present scheme. To this it is sufficient to reply, that the larger the time given, the worse the matter becomes. In 1843 there were more students than at present. Up to the year 1847 there was some increase, but since then—since the establishment of the other Colleges—the number has diminished. Thirteen years' trial has only served to prove that the course is retrograde, as will be more fully shown hereafter; while other Colleges, having comparatively no endowment, have succeeded in getting more students in *half the time*. Surely this

n for

fact should silence the plea for an extension of the "days of grace." It is foolish then to hope that this Institution will yield better fruits in the future. What are the facts of the case? Students are actually, in a sense, paid for attending; they are solicited, and yet they will not come. There are *ninety* scholarships, of thirty pounds each, besides throwing off tuition fees, offered to the public; these sums are nearly sufficient to defray all a student's expenses, and yet the tempting baits are refused. Half the newspapers of the Province are paid for advertising these great inducements: they are made to say in effect,—"*Young men of Canada, go to the University of Toronto, and you will get thirty pounds a year—tuition, library, apparatus, lectures, the prestige of the Provincial University—all for nothing!*" and yet *only thirty* respond to the call! I question whether there is a parallel to this in all history. Nor is it because there are not young men in this province who need the advantages thus offered, and who are prepared to use them; for other Colleges at which the students are at great expense during their four years' course, are well attended. Trinity College has nearly fifty matriculated students; Queen's College is now very prosperous, while Victoria College has nearly as many students in its University and Grammar School, as there are in University College and U. Canada College put together; and all these have to pay the full amount of all their bills. The prosperity of these Institutions, the health and efficiency of their proceedings, will effectually prevent the youth of the denominations to which they belong from resorting to University College; and this latter School is thus, as I have said before, left practically to be sustained or attended only by the youth of the Baptist, Congregational, Free, and United Presbyterian Churches. While matters stand thus, the attendance must by necessity be small; no bribes held out to young men can render it otherwise. As now constituted and conducted, the University of Toronto is a grand, an expensive failure; the experiment has been long enough tried—and has failed in every respect: it should teach the advocates of a "great Provincial University" a great lesson: it should prevent Government from making bad worse, by adding Law and Medical Colleges: and it should call upon Parliament to devise some means by which the immense funds now so utterly wasted, may be successfully applied to the noble object for which they were originally intended—the promotion of University education, upon sound christian principles.

MORE ANON.

April 5th, 1856.

LETTER III.

This famous University has already cost the people of Canada \$636,338 ; its annual expenditure is over \$40,000 ; it has been thirteen years in operation, and yet, according to the return of Dr. McCaul to parliament, the number of matriculated students in 1854, was only *twenty-eight*. Of these, *twenty-four were paid for attending*, each receiving, in scholarships, fees, &c., nearly \$160 a year. Ninety such scholarships are offered to the public, through the well-paid weekly agencies of our newspapers ; and yet, the youth of Canada refuse to come ; they prefer to attend other colleges that have no such baits to offer, and at which they have to meet a heavy annual expenditure of money. What stronger proof can be given or required, that the "Great Provincial University" has proved a great failure ? The aphorism that "nothing has been created in vain," will henceforth have lost its force in Canada. The advocates of this Institution wished to create a light that would attract the gaze of the youth of the entire province : but these turn away their faces, and the light shines to very little purpose. If it is not a "candle put under a bushel," it is a light which but very few see—like one of those distant luminaries which astronomers tell us lie buried deep in space, and whose light, if it has not been created in vain, has at least not yet reached our Canadian world. But I am wrong ; it has been created for the benefit of a well-paid staff of Professors ; and it now exists *practically*, although they are in no wise censurable for it, for the benefit of the Free Church, United Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists. The people of Canada pay \$40,000 a year for both these great purposes ; after the long fought battle remove it out of the hands of Dr. Strachan, by parliamentary bungling, now exists for the parties I have named.

In 1851 or —2, when Mr. Hincks had the present University Act before parliament, he stated openly, that the annual expense of the U. College should not exceed £6,000, and that the surplus of the University endowment should be distributed among the other Colleges. Upon the repeated assurances of Mr. Hincks to this effect, before the House, the denominations having colleges established and their friends in parliament, ceased their opposition to the measure : the game took with the country, and the bill passed. But the clause limiting the expenditure to £6,000 a year was conveniently and quietly struck out unnoticed ! All the income, amounting to more than \$40,000 a year is expended ; \$30,000 more is now proposed to be added for the benefit of some twelve or fourteen needy, but aspiring lawyers and doctors in Toron-

MORE ANON.

n for

to, and buildings are about to be erected at an expense of \$280,000! In this way has faith been shamefully broken with the country, and with those denominations whose aid was invoked in passing Mr. Hincks' iniquitous bill; and as if in retributive justice, the country in its turn now breaks faith with the University and its dishonest projectors: they leave it like Sir John Moore, but in a very different sense, "*alone* in its glory." This is one cause of the failure of University College.

Before showing any other cause, permit me, Sir, to ask, whose is the immense endowment wasted in the foolish attempt to support this standing monument and reproach of the unwise legislation of the parliament of Canada? Is it the property of the people of this country, or merely of parliament—over which the "free and independent electors" have no control—something which parliament can use as it pleases—even to the purchase of a costly bauble, a "Great Provincial University," whose twenty-eight undergraduates,—"even European Universities will delight to honour," for so runs the aspiring ambitious language of its advocates. The answer to this question is this—the princely endowment, 226,000 acres of the public lands, was given by the Crown in 1828, and expressly to found a "University or Universities" for the people of Canada. This was its sole object, and the endowment, therefore belongs to the public, only that its use is restricted to the founding of a "University or Universities," for such I believe are the words of the document conveying the property.

Parliament then can never alienate these lands, or apply them to any other purpose; and it is bound to apply them in such a way as will best subserve the purposes intended: the promotion of "University education upon Christian principles." But the advocates of one "Great University" will say, "The endowment is so applied; no one denomination is favoured more than another; no tests are imposed; no system of religious doctrine is permitted to be taught; and the *noble Provincial University* is open alike to all." Very well, gentlemen; but if I send my son to this great School, what guarantee can you give me that the morals of my child will be protected, and his religious—I do not say denominational—principles not subverted? The only reply to this is, "The present scheme can give no such guarantee, for the law forbids the teaching of even general Christian truth." Then, gentlemen, I cannot send my son to a University wanting the fundamental requisite of a School for a Christian people, however high its pretensions, or great the abilities of its Professors.

of \$280,000! In
ry, and with those
cks' iniquitous bill;
breaks faith with
it like Sir John
This is one cause

, whose is the im-
port this standing
liament of Canada?
ly of parliament—
ontrol—something
urchase of a costly
ght undergraduates,
so runs the aspiring
question is this—
s, was given by the
r Universities" for
endowment, there-
the founding of a
words of the docu-

y them to any other
s will best subserve
cation upon Chris-
iversity" will say,
favoured more than
ctrine is premitted
open alike to all."
School, what guar-
protected, and his
verted? The only
arantee, for the law
Then, gentlemen, I
mental requisite of a
sions, or great the

To whom then can parents look for the fostering of religious principles in the present University? Who is the responsible party in such great matters? Is it the President, or the President and Faculty combined? The law expressly forbids their interference in these matters, and effectually screens them from all such responsibilities. There is no party responsible then—and this being the fact, a Christian community cannot send their sons to such a School. This is a second reason why University College is shunned by the youth of the province.

It is quite otherwise in the case of the Colleges conducted by the several Christian denominations; they *do* afford the guarantee in question. Take, for instance, Victoria College. The Institution is under the general direction of the Methodist Conference—a body of Christian ministers—and this simple fact inspires the Methodist people, indeed the community at large, with the fullest confidence, that sound morality will be inculcated, and that religious, though not denominational, principles will be respected and impressed upon the minds of the students generally; in a word, that irreligion will be discountenanced, and Christian piety cherished and respected. The Conference holds itself responsible to the country for conducting such a School. This is the guarantee; the country accepts it, and sustains the Institution; indeed it is sustained by nearly all the Protestant churches of the Province, notwithstanding the heavy expenses attending it. The parents prefer to send their sons where they are sure their morals and religion will be protected, rather than take them to University College, even though they might receive \$120 a year and tuition free, if they attend the latter School. While the several denominational Colleges can give securities of this nature, and U. College, from the simple fact of its being a Government Institution, cannot do so, it will lack students, except from the denominations before named, and from parties residing in or near Toronto, who can, in the mean time, exercise parental control over their children.

Now, with all these very obvious conclusions, corroborated by the teachings of experience for the last thirteen years, is it wise, or politic, or just, for parliament to persist in this idle waste of the public money? The country must see that the plan devised has not succeeded thus far,—and still less can it succeed in the future (there being several good Schools, aided by the religious feeling of the people, to compete with it) than in the past, when these Schools were only struggling into existence. The scheme adopted for providing and encouraging University education in Canada, through means of the University endowment, has utterly failed. The money is wasted; there

m for

is no suitable return for the immense expenditure. The leading politicians of the day, who are so rich in resources and contrivances of another kind, can surely devise some other plan that will meet the exigencies of the case. Before them they have the teachings of experience; let them profit by the lessons of the past. Present men have this advantage over their predecessors; they know at least what the country will *not* support; let them then devise some new plan for the distribution and application of this great University endowment, that while it promotes the noble object for which this was given, will at the same time respect the religious feelings, or religious prejudices of the people, for without this no measure can be successful. A very useful lesson may be learned from our neighbours in the State of New York, where the Government—though utterly repudiating the support of religion by the money of the State—instead of establishing *one University for all*, as we have foolishly done in Canada, has wisely preferred to aid existing denominational, though not *sectarian* Colleges, but at the same time carefully providing that the money so given is expended solely for the promotion of literary and scientific education. A much greater amount of good is effected in this way, for Governments cannot be economical, while denominations can be, even without being parsimonious.

But the friends of the present system will object, that those denominations which cannot support Colleges of their own, would in this way be wronged—deprived of their share of the University endowment. Not at all; although they should expect to submit to some disadvantages naturally connected with smallness of numbers. To meet their case, I would not abandon University College altogether; let it be sustained and conducted for them, but let its expenses be limited, as Mr. Hincks promised to do, say to half its present income, \$20,000 a year. This would be dealing liberally with such bodies; the Institution can be efficiently conducted with that amount, combined with denominational aid. Then let the leading men of these bodies have more to do with the management of the Institution, and the Government less. Fostered by the government in this way, the higher kinds of education would soon become general; a healthful emulation would be created, and good would be done. The plan would succeed in Canada as well as in New York; and we would have the happiness of seeing our noble University endowment applied to the very purposes for which it was intended, instead of being wasted as it is at present, or bestowed upon briefless lawyers, and unskilful doctors, as is proposed to be done.

MORE ANON.

April 12th, 1856.

LETTER IV.

I can scarcely tell how I came to omit, in the communication of last week, one of the two chief causes of the falling off in the number of students, in attendance at University College, since it was present to my mind at the time; it is the following very obvious one. Before the establishing of Queen Victoria, and Trinity Colleges, the Provincial University was sustained by the whole community. There was no other University in the country; but as soon as others were established, they, as a matter of course, drew away the youth of their respective denominations, and left the Toronto University in its present unfortunate position, to be sustained only by those who have no Colleges of their own, and who constitute only a small portion of the people of Canada. This third, and perhaps chief hinderance to the prosperity of the Provincial University will be a standing one; no remedy can meet this case, and the prosperity of University College is thus rendered impossible. Why then should the immense endowment which is the property of the Province, be foolishly expended as it now is, in educating the *few*, while the *many* can possibly derive no benefit from it? Surely a law which as in this case excludes the vast majority of the people from participating in its provisions, must be ill suited to the circumstances of the community for which it was framed. The minority comply with its provisions, the majority cannot do so; and is not this of itself a sufficient condemnation of the entire scheme and provisions of the present University Act?

The law being as I have now shown, and the success of University College, as a great Provincial Institution, rendered impossible, as a necessary consequence of the prosperity of the other Colleges, why will the Governor-General and his Ministry persist in adding foolishness to folly, in attempting to establish Colleges of Law and Medicine in connection with the unproductive School already in operation? This is sufficiently unpopular now; the step proposed will render it still more so, since it will inflict a greater public wrong upon the people. Is there any valid reason why the Legal and Medical professions should not be able to sustain themselves in this country? And if the Government persist in this unwise course, will that induce the Methodists, and the Churches of England and Scotland to abandon their own institutions, simply lest University College should fall to the ground? Most certainly not. It is a mark of insanity to think so. Let Government then abandon their project; let them advise Dr. Connor and the Legal and Medical gentlemen who petitioned the House, to bestir themselves in their

m for

professions, and not depend for their support upon salaries from Government. Perhaps the Government cannot afford to loose much public sympathy at the present moment; the establishment of these schools—simply for a few gentlemen in Toronto, would not add to their popularity. One thing would render them popular, and that is, the remodeling of the scheme for disposing of the University endowment, in such a manner as would save it from the utter waste attending the present plan, and as would at the same time enable the people of Canada generally to avail themselves of the great advantages which a liberal distribution of this fund is capable of bestowing. As I showed in my last, the people of the state of New York learned this lesson years ago; let us follow their wise example.

I have spoken repeatedly of the great waste of money in the present University, in which upwards of \$40,000 are expended annually, in the education of twenty-eight matriculated students. It may be interesting to the country, though it may excite indignation and disgust at the wretched manner in which the public money is squandered, to be informed of how the funds are applied. The following are a few of the items. The Bursar's office consumes annually upwards of \$5,900. There are nine Professors and one Lecturer who receive \$17,240. The library is by no means large, and yet in 1853, there were a Librarian and *four Assistants*. In addition to the Bursar and his five or six clerks, University College has another clerk of its own. The Senate meets once or twice a year, about a week at a time, and yet this body has a Messenger with a fixed salary. Then there is a Beadle for the College and Senate; he too has a fixed income. The Professor of Natural History, of Natural Philosophy, and of Chemistry, has each a paid attendant or servant. There is in addition a Bell-ringer, a very useful officer, an outdoor servant, a general servant, &c., and each of these petty functionaries has a fixed annual salary. For the twenty-eight students in 1854, there were eighteen Examiners, almost an examiner for each student, who received \$1440 for their services. The silver medals for 1854 cost \$747; stationery \$976; printing \$432; advertising throughout the Province \$384; and after all this expenditure and advertising every where, only *twenty-eight* students could be prevailed upon to attend! Surely here is a practical illustration of the "mountain in labor." But it is not necessary to draw further from the published Report; enough has been already given to show "the way the money goes."

And will the public remain silent under such a wretched, shameless squan-

s from Government.
public sympathy at
—simply for a few

One thing would
scheme for disposing
d save it from the
the same time en-
of the great advan-
bestowing. As I
learned this lesson

on the present Uni-
y, in the education
ing to the country,
ed manner in which
w the funds are ap-
er's office consumes
and one Lecturer
and yet in 1853,
to the Bursar and
k of its own. The
e, and yet this body
eadle for the Col-
ofessor of Natural
ch a paid attendant
eful officer, an out-
petty functionaries
uts in 1854, there
ndent, who received
\$747; stationery
ovince \$384; and
only twenty-eight
is a practical illus-
ry to draw further
to show "the way

d, shameless squan-

dering of our fine endowment, which is sufficient, if wisely applied, to educate the youth of the entire Province, in the higher kinds of studies? Why is the Press of Toronto silent in regard to this matter? Is it because the money is expended in that city? Has the *Globe* lost its tongue? It professes—and I often rejoice in its boldness and intrepidity—to expose all corruption and humbug. Why is it silent while this great imposition is palmed off before its eyes upon the whole province? But I believe its Editor is a friend to the establishment of one "Great Provincial University." Is this the cause? Indeed I believe the member for Lambton wishes to add the law and medical colleges, which will nearly double the present very generous outlay.

In 1854 the ordinary expenditure was \$41,164, and the number of matriculated students twenty-eight. Each of these cost the Province that year \$1,468; and this sum repeated through each of the four years of the University course, amounts to \$5,872 for a single graduate! This is the cost to the Province for each A. B., that emanates from the University of Toronto! "Poor Richard" would say, it is a pretty good price for a "whistle." Let the people look at it and apply the remedy.

I stated in a former article that Governments cannot be economical; and have we not in the wretched management of this "Grand Provincial University" the strongest, and at the same time the most painful proof possible of the truth of that assertion? How many young men could be well educated at the other colleges, where an A. B., possesses fully as much intrinsic value, and its holders are fully as well trained, for this immense sum, were the funds wisely distributed! And then how much better, were efficient colleges established in various parts of the Province, than to attempt thus to concentrate all light at a single point, even were the attempt successful. Much more so then when the money that belongs alike to all the young men of Canada, is so shamefully lavished, and the attempt an utter, a ridiculous failure.

MORE ANON.

April 19th, 1856.

LETTER V.

I am credibly informed that a meeting of the Senate of the so-called "Provincial University" has been called to recommend the re-establishment of the departments of Law and Medicine in this Institution. Now, Sir,

B

m for

who are the movers in this unpatriotic project? I have shown already, that University College exists *practically* for the "sole use and behoof" of the Free Church, the United Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and Baptists, the other and most numerous denominations having Colleges of their own. The leading men of the churches that support University College see that it is almost deserted by the youth of Canada. They know that the country will not long sustain it *for them* unless the number of students can be increased. They have stated that the establishment of the departments of Law and Medicine would effect this purpose, and hence the present movement. Dr. Conner and the other members of the former Faculties of Law and Medicine in the University, who perchance need a little "State support," although they were handsomely paid upon their retirement from the Institution, are the second party; and we believe there is not a third.

It will be seen that both these parties are deeply interested in the success of this project; no means will be left untried to effect it; and the country should keep a close eye upon their movements. If their will and pleasure be enacted, it will cost the country \$30,000 a year; that is, *thirty thousand dollars in addition to the forty thousand now expended; in all \$70,000, for the benefit of these Churches and the three Faculties* of Arts, Medicine, and Law! for certainly it will not be pretended that all this vast outlay is simply to educate *twenty-eight* young men!

The iniquity of this new movement is really past endurance. Will it be believed that some of the very parties who aided in getting the University out of the clutches of Dr. Strachan, as they used to say, because it existed for the benefit of his church, are now among the foremost to establish these new Colleges, in order to perpetuate a University for themselves at the public expense? Yet such is in fact the true character of this selfish project.

But apart altogether from the undisguised iniquity of this movement, I affirm that the Province should not be called upon to sustain the proposed colleges. Law and Medicine are professions—arts, I will not say trades, (though the tendency of many of their votaries is to reduce them to that level,) by means of which men expect to acquire wealth and distinction. What young man would devote himself to these pursuits, were it not for the money and position they secure? Are they not decidedly the most remunerative of all the occupations of the age? The merchant and mechanic teach the principles and practice of their professions without aid from the state; why should not the lawyer and physician do so too? And were these pro-

shown already, that
and behoof" of the
nalists and Baptists,
lleges of their own.
College see that it
y that the country
students can be in-
he departments of
the present move-
r Faculties of Law
le "State support,"
from the Institu-
third.

sted in the success
and the country
will and pleasure be
e, *thirty thousand*
; *in all \$70,000,*
ies of Arts, Med-
all this vast out-

ance. Will it be
g the University
because it existed
to establish these
themselves at the
er of this selfish

this movement, I
tain the proposed
ll not say trades,
uce them to that
and distinction.
ere it not for the
e most remunera-
mechanic teach
from the state;
were these pro-

essions left, as all others are, to propagate themselves, at the expense of those who desire to practice them, would there be any lack of lawyers and physicians? Would not private Colleges, such as the Toronto School of Medicine, be forthwith established? I believe I speak advisedly when I say, that there is not in Canada, at this moment, and there never has been, a more efficiently conducted School for teaching the knowledge of the "healing art," than the one I have named. Several medical gentlemen, who are members of parliament, from all parts of this province, I am informed, attended the late annual examination of the students of this public School; and can I not appeal to them for the truth of the assertion I have made? Yet the Toronto School of Medicine is a self-supporting Institution. It does not cost the country a single pound. Why then expend \$15,000 a year of the public money, when a better Institution is provided without cost?

The seventy young men who attend this School are willing to sustain all the expenses attending their professional studies, from the certainty of the handsome return in wealth and position which will be secured to them hereafter. They see no reason why the state should pay for instructing them in a business by which they and their families are to be supported. And the able Professors of this School are not beggars at the door of Parliament for public support; they are well enough paid without it. The mere fact that their success from year to year depends upon their own efforts, is the great spur to great exertions; whereas were they paid by the state, indifference and perfunctoriness would as necessarily mark their course, as that of all state-paid functionaries. The bread and butter of the one depend upon personal effort; that of the others is already secured by the mere routine performance of duty. This is the great parent of all inefficiency; that, of all greatness and success.

Now what has been achieved by the Toronto School of Medicine could most assuredly be done in law. Indeed it has been done already. At what state-paid college did our leading lawyers and judges graduate? Where did our Robinsons, our Macauleys and others acquire their thorough, eminent knowledge of their profession? Did the state, or private interest, supply the schools for these great men? Why then, I ask again, tax the country to the extent of \$30,000 a year, to procure us schools of Law and Medicine, when better, and in every way more successful institutions are already supplied by private enterprise, and *without cost*? The four churches already named in this and former articles, and the eight or nine Professors in University College have now \$40,000 a year expended upon them from the public chest;

m for

and is not that enough? Must \$30,000 more be given to these parties, simply, as they say themselves, that the \$40,000 may not be utterly wasted from year to year, as it now is? "We pause for a reply."

The bill now before Parliament for the support of higher education in Lower Canada, provides that £5,000 a year shall be taken from the consolidated fund, for the encouragement of collegiate education in Upper Canada, to balance a like drain of the public chest for Lower Canada. Let Parliament strike out both these clauses of the bill, and distribute annually among deserving Colleges in Upper Canada, the £7,500 of the University fund that is so wantonly, and needlessly, and selfishly about to be thrown away upon Colleges of Law and Medicine—and good will be done. The present Ministry would then do a really popular thing; then let them base the scheme of distribution upon some fair and honest principle—the amount of work done—the number of students receiving instruction; and the nature of the education given—excluding all theological or sectarian training; and if they should cease to be a Ministry to-morrow, the country would for ever thank them for that one patriotic measure.

MORE ANON.

April 25th, 1856.

LETTER VI.

I have already shown, that as the most numerous and active denominations in the province have established Colleges of their own, University College is necessarily left to be supported mainly by the other denominations. These, however, not having been parties to the present U. Act are not responsible for its unwise provisions. They certainly had nothing to do with the treacherous removal of the clause, *after it passed the House*, which limited the expenditure to £6,000 a year. But however blameless with regard to the Act as it stands, I fear that the present course of some of these parties will place them in a very different position before the country. To accept an Act from Parliament that happens greatly to favour them, is one thing; to labour to continue such an act in operation, after it has been proved valueless in results, as a general measure, and ruinously expensive withal—and to support it *because it favors them*—is quite another thing. But the iniquity and selfishness of the movement do not end here; they unite with Dr. Connor and his *expectant* Co-Professors in calling upon Parliament to add \$30,000 more annually to the present expensiveness of the University, in order to establish

iven to these parties,
not be utterly wasted
ly."

er education in Lower
om the consolidated
a Upper Canada, to
da. Let Parliament
nually among deserv-
ersity fund that is so
away upon Colleges
esent Ministry would
heme of distribution
k done—the number
e education given—
ey should cease to
k them for that one

MORE ANON.

ective denominations
University College is
minations. These,
re not responsible
do with the treach-
which limited the
with regard to the
these parties will
To accept an Act
e thing; to labour
ed valueless in re-
—and to support it
iniquity and selfish-
r. Connor and his
d \$30,000 more
order to establish

Medical and Law Schools; not at all because these Schools are needed, but simply, as they say themselves, to prevent University College from dying out or being utterly deserted by the youth of Canada; for in that case they would be deprived of the means of educating their youth at the expense of the public.

This is a very modest demand, to say the least of it; yet how else can we interpret their conduct? And if they repudiate this charge, then why does the Editor of the *Globe*, in his place in the House, and why do Doctors Willis, Lillie and Taylor, in the University Senate, strongly recommend the establishment of these schools? Let those answer who can. Yet are not these the leading public men of the several churches for whose sole use U. College may be said now to exist? Loud and vehement were the charges against "John Toronto"—his selfishness and dishonesty—when he laboured to have King's College conducted at the public expense, for the special benefit of his church; let the country draw the distinction between that and the present course of the parties I have named, and then apply the proper—the same remedy. But this verdict is what they dread; they see it looming up before them in the distance; and therefore the effort to forestall public action, by the establishment of these unnecessary schools, in order, as they say, to increase the attendance at U. College, and so, if possible, prevent its suppression. Here are the motive and the object; let the country judge of them.

But this whole scheme is as unfair as it is selfish. Queen's, Victoria, and Trinity Colleges have established Medical Schools, and without any expense to the public, since the suppression of these departments in the Provincial University. To raise up a rival Institution now, at the public expense, is both unfair and altogether unnecessary—at least until it can be shown that these Institutions authorize men to practice medicine without a fair knowledge of their profession. The existing Medical Schools are established on the only legitimate basis. Why should men who make their fortunes out of the public expect also to be educated at the expense of that public? Were I a lawyer or a physician, and I am neither, I would feel that the merchant and mechanic had equal claims for the education and training necessary for their respective professions.

The last argument which I shall adduce against the establishment of the proposed Colleges amongst us is this: it is affirmed upon very high authority, that both in England and the United States, Law and Physic are taught by self-supporting Institutions. Why, then, should it be otherwise in Canada? The reply of Dr. Connor and his friends to this question would be very con-

on for

clusive, and would no doubt have great weight with us, were it not so intimately connected with *personal* rather than public interests.

* I shall close this article with a few general remarks respecting the University and U. College. No means, however expensive, have been left untried, that were likely to make this Institution successful. Immense sums have been lavished upon it. Students have been solicited to attend, with the liberal offer of what is nearly equivalent to "free commons" and "free lectures;" this gratuitous offer has been proclaimed through the ten thousand weekly mouths of our provincial newspapers; *ninety* scholarships have been sent a begging through the country; and yet less than one-third of them have been accepted! while other Colleges that can present no such inducements, where the students have to pay every bill, are full to overflowing! Does history present a parallel to this? "Surely" "there must be something rotten in this state of Denmark."

Again, while the staff of Professors has been greatly increased, the attendance is less than in 1843, when the Institution opened as King's College; then it was forty-one, now it is but twenty-eight; indeed the number of students seems to be inverse ratio to the general expenses and facilities for their instruction. The whole scheme from the beginning was an extravagant and foolish one. Instead of adding Professors as the wants of the Institution demanded, the entire staff was sent on before there were any students to attend some of the lectures. There is a Professor of Chemistry, one of Agriculture, one of Geology, and one of Natural History. Neither of these gentlemen has more than two classes; and I am very credibly informed, that even this last winter, after years of labour, some of the classes of these Professors had *but two students in them!* Comment upon this is unnecessary. Let the admirers of "one great Provincial University" look at it, and answer to the country for their advocacy of the continuance of such an Institution.

But once more; as if the youth of Candda had already shown any great predilection for this Institution, and *all* were expected to attend, a mammoth building is now projected; about \$300,000 have been appropriated for its erection, and forthwith Mr. Frederick Cumberland is despatched to visit European Universities, and prepare plans for the proposed edifice, *to accommodate twenty-eight students*, and be an "ornament to our city." For of the latter only will the Press of Toronto speak, and such only will they, by and by, proclaim it. When this "ornament" will have proved itself another "Tadmor in the wilderness," I should say, in the city, I hope this Press will be ready to inform the public of the amount of work done, and the success of

the Institution. Upon the whole, I question whether there was ever before exhibited a greater amount of stupid fatality than in the entire management of our "one great Provincial University," and its splendid, but wasted endowment.

I have now shown enough to establish the want of practical wisdom and political foresight in the men who devised this unproductive University scheme. The people for whom it was intended, and the Institutions already in existence were not understood. Like the numerous political constitutions framed by Frenchmen upon "broad philosophical principles," it looks fine on paper, but like them, also, it is unsound; for when tested, the philosophical scheme of "one great Provincial University" for the people of this country, has proved a miserable failure. Inert matter is every where the same, and the laws that govern it are fixed. Not so the laws that govern men and nations; these must be suited to the genius of the people for whom they are intended—to their education, their institutions, and even to their tastes and prejudices. While the other Colleges exist and are efficiently conducted, the deeply seated religious feeling of our people will guarantee their prosperity; and that which assures this, writes the doom of the so-called Provincial School. From the very necessities of the case, both cannot prosper at the same time. The denominations having Colleges will send their youth to their own Institutions, where moral and religious principles will be sustained and cherished. Suppress these Schools and then "one University for all" may have a *forced* growth—but not otherwise.

What a much greater amount of good could be effected in the education of the people by the expenditure of these large sums of money, were we to borrow a leaf from the book of our practical neighbours, the Americans. Instead of attempting to create one, or any number of lights, under the expensive direction of Government, they have more wisely aided those established by the several denominations, but, at the same time, carefully guarding that the aid afforded is not used for sectarian purposes. And cannot our government do so too? Can they not require annual reports from the several Colleges, showing that the amount given is applied strictly for literary and scientific purposes. And if this is not sufficient let Government appoint one or more Commissioners, who shall attend the annual examinations of the Colleges receiving aid; let these report annually to Parliament, as to the nature of the education imparted, the amount of work done, and the due observance of the conditions imposed, in order to prevent the application of

ion for

the aid given for the furtherance of any purely sectarian ends. Let this point be well guarded, as in the United States, and where the conditions are not honestly complied with, let the annual grant be withheld. In denominational hands more will be effected by the expenditure of a thousand pounds, in promoting the higher education of the community, than by double this amount in the hands of Government. And then, in order to remove all cause of complaint, let University College be conducted for the benefit of those denominations and parties who are unable to establish Colleges for themselves; but let the annual expenses be reduced to the limits proposed by Mr. Hincks, when he deceived the country into acquiescence with his bill in 1851 or—2; that is £6,000. If judiciously applied the amount is amply sufficient to give efficiency to the Institution—considering the proportion of the population that will be likely to avail themselves of its advantages. The remainder of the University endowment, distributed amongst the other Colleges, according to Mr. Hincks' unfulfilled promise, and in proportion to the character and amount of work done, will effect more in twenty years, in promoting the higher kinds of education in this country, than could possibly be done by Government in whole century.

May 7, 1856.

MORE ANON.